

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.N.KRISHNAN

TUESDAY, THE 14TH AUGUST 2007 / 23RD SRAVANA 1929

CRP.No. 684 of 2006()

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 23/03/2005 IN IA.NO.6481/2004 IN
LAR.384/1988 of III ADDL.SUB COURT, ERNAKULAM
.....

REVN. PETITIONER: PETITIONERS/CLAIMANTS:

1. ANNAKUTTY KURIAKOSE (DIED).
2. MRS.SUSEELA KURIACHAN, W/O.KURIACHAN,
003 KRISHNA MANOR, KARIKKAMURI CROSS ROAD,
ERNAKULAM, KOCHI-11.
3. MRS.GEETHA KUNJUMON, W/O.KUNJUMON,
KOOMULLIL HOUSE, PAMPARA DESOM, MANEED VILLAGE.
4. MRS.AMEENA SHAJAN, W/O. SHAJAHAN,
PALLIPURATH HOUSE, KARICODE DESOM,
MULANTHURUTHY VILLAGE.
5. MRS. ANITHA POULOSE, W/O. POULOSE,
KOOMULLIL HOUSE, PAMPRA DESOM, MANEED VILLAGE.

BY ADV. SMT.P.P.STELLA

RESPONDENTS: RESPONDENT/RESPONDENT:

STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,ERNAKULAM.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT. R. BINDU

THIS CIVIL REVISION PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 14/08/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE
FOLLOWING:

M.N.KRISHNAN, J.

C.R.P.No. 684 OF 2006 C

Dated this the 14th August, 2007.

O R D E R

This civil revision petition is preferred against the order in I.A.6481/04 in L.A.R.384/88. After a lapse of 13 years of the passing of the award an application is filed to the effect that there are clerical mistakes in the decree and judgment and it has to be corrected by incorporating the statutory benefits to the amount awarded by the awarding officer. At the outset I may like to point out that if an amount is not awarded by a court it amounts to negating of that relief and the person who is aggrieved has to choose the appropriate forum that is by way of appeal to get his grievance redressed. Further, it appears in this case that the statutory benefits intended to be claimed by the claimant were not originally available to him as per law according to the then prevailing provisions of the Land Acquisition Act. So, there is no omission committed by the court below and there is no arithmetical or clerical mistakes as the revision petitioner wants to project. The court below has considered the matter in the correct perspective and

disallowed the application. I do not find any ground to interfere. Therefore C.R.P is dismissed.

M.N.KRISHNAN
Judge